

Life, Death & Government  
Copyright © 2018 by Safearus

All rights reserved. This book or any portion thereof may not be reproduced or used in any manner whatsoever without the express written permission of the publisher except for the use of brief quotations in a book review.

This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/> or send a letter to Creative Commons, PO Box 1866, Mountain View, CA 94042, USA.

You are free to:

Share, copy and redistribute this material in any medium or format.

Adapt, remix, transform, and build upon the material for any purpose, even commercially.

This book is only copyrighted to prevent others from copyrighting it. No legal actions will be taken to those who copy, edit, distribute or sell this work under the following conditions:

You must give appropriate credit, provide a link to the license, and indicate if changes were made. You may do so in any reasonable manner, but not in any way that suggests the licensor endorses you or your use.

No additional restrictions— You may not apply legal terms or technological measures that legally restrict others from doing anything the license permits.

ISBN-13: 978-1723146114 (CreateSpace-Assigned)

ISBN-10: 1723146110

Createspace.com

## CONTENTS

()-----()

CREATIVE-COMMONS & COPYRIGHT NOTICE - 1

CONTENTS - 2

TITLE PAGE - 3

()-----()

A ROUSING INTRODUCTION – 4

()-----()

### **THE DIALOGUES:**

*PART I: ANARCHY & THE STATE (5-14)*

*PART II: LIFE, DEATH, MORALITY & LOGIC (15-27)*

()-----()

APHORISMS (28-33)

# LIFE, DEATH & GOVERNMENT

## A ROUSING INTRODUCTION

It is a recent disease in human history to cite others as the primary gauge of right and wrong, rather than oneself. Namely, those social institutions which profess self-sacrifice to others and obedience to authority. This has resulted in not a peaceful and civilized society, but rather a culture devoted to bloodshed and violence. Indeed those institutions of religion and government promise freedom, persecution of the wicked and defending of the weak. However, they have all ended horribly due to one flaw in their ideology. This flaw will be hard to honestly consider by most of the people on this planet, who, from birth have been thought to respect whatever god was foisted upon them by those around them. I do not just refer to religious deities, but all forms of irrationality and superstition, which a god embodies. I do not write to persuade, but to inform you of the truth of the tyranny that infests this world. I want you to decide for yourself who's side you are on. This one twisted superstition that has plagued humanity for thousands of years, this insidious blight, this virus infesting the minds of billions that will not stop until it destroys its host and all of those around it; you and I. Or, we find the cure, it's weakness: the truth.

This atrocity, this one word:

AUTHORITY

## PART I

### ANARCHY & THE STATE

“Taxes, the contribution to the common good of society. A badge of honour to wear, to be known as a “law-abiding tax-payer” and a respected member of the group. These sacrifices pay for roads, public schools, military, helping the poor, stopping crime and delivering justice!”

This is what you have been taught by your friends, family, school and media. You have faithfully believed this message without a second thought on the truth of such a claim. You have never seriously considered an opposing viewpoint on this matter, as that would seem obscene. There is no possibility that you could be wrong, is there? I, of course always accept this possibility, however your convictions are stronger than mine, yet they are not based on reason but on faith. Understand then, that conviction is not a proof of truth nor is popularity, nor is who made the claim, that being authority. Now, I lay this claim on the cold, sterile table of operation and unpack my implements of dissection. You can still turn away if you do not want to see the truth and to continue living in the happiness you think you have. I will show you what you do not want to see, but need to see in order to live. No, not

just to live, but to live well. It is the disease that infests your brain that I will remove, this disease, this cancer is the myth of authority. Your time has come.

Let us begin with the claim that government exists...

“Well, of course government exists! That's insane.”

I was getting to that. I am not insane, it is just that my head is different than yours. Conformity is no standard for mental health. Anyhow, there are plenty of symbols of government, such as flags, cars, guns, people in uniforms, planes, buildings and papers. However, all of these things together do not constitute government. What if I had all of these things, would I be recognised as government?

“No, possibly a dictator or a terrorist”

Why is that?

“Because you would have tons of power and no restraints”

What makes government limited?

“Our government is democratically elected, so we get to choose who is in power. If we don't like who is in charge right now, they will get thrown out after the next election. There is also limits on our government's power by the checks and balances of the three branches and constitution.”

Do bad people get into office often?

“Well...yeah”

Why?

“Because the people don't know how to choose good leaders”

But if they don't know how to choose good leaders, then why give them the power to choose leaders?

“Because without democracy there is only anarchy or a dictatorship”

So how do incompetent leaders uphold peace and prosperity?

“They can't...”

Is that really any better than chaos?

“No. But we have to fix the system to elect better leaders”

How do you plan on doing that except by election, protest or petition which would be effectively useless? Since there are so many of these bad people in office, it makes no sense to appeal to them to pass any laws that would seriously change anything.

“Well, we could tear this government down through revolution and rebuild anew”

How would that prevent corruption?

“Because laws would prohibit politicians being bought out”

How would that be enforced?

“By the people”

Which people?

“The government...”

On that note, what makes government any better than a gang of thugs?

“They provide resources and services like the military and roads”

Where do they get the funding for these services?

“Taxes”

If I steal 20\$ from you and buy you a hat at the end of the year, it would be considered theft. You had not consented to me taking the 20\$, nor to receiving the hat. There may be some services that you want that government currently provides like defence and roads, but others that you do not want like bombing foreign lands or welfare. Why not just pay for the services that you want?

“When you are born into a country, you are bound by a social contract to pay taxes and obey laws, even if you don't think they are right”

Even if I think they are immoral? Like a law ordering me to attack a stranger for no good reason?

“No, only the laws that don't hurt others”

What about hurting myself, like by way of taxation? What gives the life of others more value than my own life?

“Because you need to contribute to the common good as a part of society in order to obtain it's benefits like healthcare or roads”

Is this social contract written down somewhere?



“Well, no. It's assumed when you are born”

So it is forced?

“No, you can always choose to leave when you get old enough”

To where?

“Syria, Pakistan...places of anarchy”

Why are those places regarded as anarchy?

“Because they are chaotic”

How chaotic does something need to be before it is anarchy?

“Any, there are degrees of anarchy”

Another definition of anarchy, which is mutually exclusive from the first definition of chaos, is a complete absence of government. The places you mentioned are in fact, not anarchy according to the second definition but rather hyper-statism. That is, multiple governments competing for control over the people. To wrap things up with the social contract: it is forced, it cannot be escaped unless choosing to die, it can be changed at anytime and must be obeyed at all times. Sound about right?

“Yes, but that's the price we pay for living in a free society”

So in order to live in a “free” society we have to submit ourselves to whatever whim the corrupt politicians tell us? That's not free at all.

“Well...it's still better than anarchy, that would just be

chaos”

How would the absence of corrupt politicians be chaos?

“Warlords would take over”

You know the “leaders” you have are incompetent to serve society and don't care about you. They seek war to further their own ends at every opportunity. They take from you what they want and let you keep just enough scraps to prevent you from rebelling. What makes them any different than the warlords?

“But how would we pay for roads and healthcare in any other way? People wouldn't pay for them voluntarily”

Why wouldn't they?

“Because people don't know what is in their own interest; humans are inherently violent.”

That's obviously not true for anyone who has acted to benefit their own survival and prosperity. Which, even if misguided, is all people. Not to mention that if humans are inherently evil, then appointing some of these humans to boss around the rest of them makes no sense.

“What about people who commit suicide? They act for their own destruction.”

That is more of the brain shutting down from lack of pleasure, it is a deficiency that destroys them. Much like starving to death.

“But how would people behave voluntarily? What

incentive do they have to not rob others?”

Their incentive is a greater network of resources, an open community and avoiding getting shot by someone whom they try to mug. Or leave others alone so that they too are left in peace.

“What would prevent warlords from taking over or terrorists from attacking?”

Communities could hire the emerging private security companies after the state's monopoly on the use of force has left. They could also hire an assassin to kill off any aspiring warlords.

“What do you mean that 'the state has a monopoly on the use of force'?”

That any private security companies acting in competition to the services of government will be destroyed by being deemed “illegal”. There are security companies now, but they are only allowed to phone the government security company in the event of, let's say, a robbery. This company is called “police”. If someone doesn't like the quality, cost, efficiency or morality of these agents, they still have to pay for them and cannot choose anyone else to defend them or provide a court session.

“But police are mostly good people”

No. They aren't. They force politicians “laws” onto everybody and disregard their own standards for morality.

Anyone who works for the police has to enforce each of these “laws” else their employment will cease. So, they have an incentive to enforce arbitrary “laws” such as those that order them to capture or kill anyone who has a certain plant, such as marijuana. These crooks are ready to use force on anyone who resists their extortion. It is just so few people resist because either they feel an obligation to obey, or simply to prevent further harm to themselves. Those serving “government” may have good intentions but they are serving evil.

“What if one of these security companies becomes too powerful and starts polluting the environment or threatening people?”

For reference, that's what the government does. But a company under anarchy needs to please the people, else they will lose sales. However, under a government, a company can buyout politicians and have them pass “laws” that allow them to gain access to untapped resources, avoid “taxes” or get subsidies. Since government is recognised as legitimate, most people will not resist any actions taken on part of those claiming to represent it. There will be no such things under anarchy as there will be no government to buyout in the first place. “What about taking care of the poor, buying roads, healthcare and schools?”

As we have already discussed, people will act on their own impulses to benefit themselves. However, how one would go about funding these procedures is another question. Primarily, schools, helping the poor and roads would all be funded by donation. They are important enough to most people that they are at least willing to contribute something for value in return. Companies could build structures or help the needy to gain public admiration and trust. Before the welfare state made them “illegal”, there used to be a lot of mutual aid societies. Together with charities, they took good care of the needy. Private roads could be used for a small fee in order to maintain the road. If the fee is becoming too expensive, demand would increase for a less expensive road, and either it would be built or the owner of the expensive road would be forced to decrease their fee. Healthcare can be handled by a mutual aid society, which is a voluntary subscription to pay for community healthcare while making it affordable to all people. Since not all people need their healthcare except occasionally for doctor check-ups, this would cover anyone who faced catastrophic problems. These societies could choose to exclude smokers or overweight people, or just have them pay more for their increased risk of monetary burden.

“What if someone builds a road all the way around a

community and charges a huge amount of money in order to use it?”

It wouldn't be profitable to do so. The people would buy the surrounding land enough to prevent this from happening when initially claiming the land, or they would just move away.

“Hmm...let me think about all of this. I'll talk to you tomorrow”

## PART II

### LIFE, DEATH, MORALITY & LOGIC

“I thought about what you said yesterday and I see how irrational I have been to believe that government was ever the solution to humanity's problems”

Wow, that's a first. Most people just bury their heads in the sand.

“Yeah. I thought up a few more questions, if anarchy is truly right then why do so few people believe in it?”

It's the same reason any person believes in irrational claims, because the people around them reinforce and spread the claims. This usually occurs in parents to children due to the child's trusting nature and being around their parents a majority of the time. Obedience to “authority” occurs because obedience is rewarded and disobedience is punished. The media typically encourages such irrationality too, mostly due to the mainstream variety being controlled by the “state”. However, the system isn't perfect, now with the internet, more people can find the information to wake up.

“Now that I think of it, how would you define government?”

The state is that organization in a society which attempts

to maintain a legitimized monopoly on the use of force and violence in an area.

“Makes sense. Who really commits violence though? The state or those who obey the state's 'orders'?

Of course, those who obey “orders”. A dictator has no power if their subjects just see him as a thug. It's the belief that a person has a special right to force others to obey their whims that causes so much violence. This, of course, means that if enough people started to ignore the demands of “government”, then the whole system of extortion and racketeering would collapse. There aren't enough thugs to control the rest of the population. No revolution, politics or assassinations required. In fact, politics only furthers the belief in authority by making it seem a legitimate way of solving problems.

“Good. So, what should you and I do in the meantime?”

I recommend staying anonymous among non-anarchists. Even then, keep a low profile. I wouldn't want you to be persecuted. Judging by the way this “government” is headed, I would expect such persecutions to increase. The internet is one of the best places to spread Anarchism; it allows for total anonymity and the ability to reach a larger audience. Of course, it is a means to an end. Often times in this insane culture, your prosperity depends on your ability to convince others that you respect the noises and



scribbles they call “law”.

“I’ll be sure to. The next questions aren’t so much on government, as I think that matter is settled for now. But, on how we should live in absence of government.”

Sure, like a moral code?

“Yeah. Since so much of most people’s morality revolves around obeying authority or society, I figure a new code is in order”

I agree that most people’s morality isn’t thought out. But I think the destructive effects of personally believing that one must sacrifice themselves to others, or live for the well-being of others is what prevents them from finding happiness. It is, in fact, helping others whatsoever is driven by selfishness. No, not greed, but self-interest. It is in the best interest of one’s self to work voluntarily with others to mutually attain goals. This is, of course, the core of Anarchism.

“I think addressing the issue of divine morality from a god needs to be addressed before we can continue.”

Sure. As Epicurus put it, “Is God willing to prevent evil, but not able? Then he is not all powerful. Is he able, but not willing? Then he is malevolent. Is he both able and willing? Then evil should not exist. Is he neither able nor willing? Then why call him ‘God’?”. In other words, evil exists, therefore either God cannot prevent it and is not all

powerful, or can prevent it and chooses not to, making God evil.

“What if God is just allowing us the possibly to do evil so that we can be free? Or that humans committed original sin”

Things are determined by what happens before them, they never happen by themselves. Hence, why all of reality is predetermined. Freewill is in fact impossible as it would require the ability to make decisions not affected by any rule or influence whatsoever. But, the only way to make a decision is by rule and influence which must not be within one's own control, at least initially. If all things are predetermined then there is no freewill, if things are all random there still is not any freewill. Indeed one can will oneself, but the path of willing is predetermined. All things move towards stability. Humans are a thing. So, humans and all things humans do, aim towards stability in one way or another. I think humans, nor Gods, if they exist, are not free. As for “original sin”, there is no proof of such a thing, and even if it does it is true, it makes no sense for an all-loving God to sentence it's children to burn in hell for all eternity because of the “mistake” of their “ancestors”, Adam and Eve. Finally, there is no proof for a God's existence and it doesn't even logically make sense, as I have shown.

“So do you think all humans are predetermined by nature? That we can't make choices?”

I think while humans can make choices, the choices they make are decided by complex laws of physics beyond our current understanding. This is exemplified, more simply, in shooting an arrow at the same angle, wind speed, direction and pull on the string, will always result in the arrow landing in the exact same spot. Applying this to humans means that their behaviour is predetermined and so that they are not responsible for the choices they make. A person is not generated magically, life conditions determine the person. So, one cannot judge people as good or bad based on the choices they make, but rather on the consequences to one's self. To clarify my position, I am not an Atheist, which is someone who disbelieves in a god(s) or religion; being neutral on the subject. Rather, I am an Anti-theist, which is opposed to the existence of a god(s) and religion.

“Ok. Continue on with your proposition for a moral code”  
Perusing pleasure and avoiding pain in order to survive is all of life's goal. More specifically, the greatest pleasure it can gain for the longest time and the worst pain it can avoid for the longest time. All living organisms obey this law, else they die off. As a result only organisms that pursue such goals remain. Thus, pleasure, pain and

survival are the only criteria for moral value. The greatest pleasure, the greatest good, is a calm mind because it lasts the longest, is the easiest to attain and causes no harm as a result of it later on. The worst pain, the worst evil, is a chaotic mind because it is the easiest to attain, causes the most harm as a result of it and lasts until a calm mind is maintained. All things that promote a calm mind, the essentials of survival and logic are good and thus ought to be supported. All things that promote a chaotic mind, superfluous things and illogicality are evil and thus ought to be avoided. If it is not necessary for the maintenance of a calm mind or the removal of a chaotic mind it is best to regard it as irrelevant to you. All humans aim for the removal of pain and gaining of pleasure to the extent of their current abilities, but living is merely a requirement for pleasure, which makes life worth living. However, excitement and bodily pleasures do not last nearly as long as calmness. So, calm is superior to excitement and bodily pleasure as calm lasts longer and can easily be satisfied. The most pleasant life requires that one abstain from unnecessary desires and achieve an inner calm by being content with simple things. Being content with the simple things in life ensures that one will never be disappointed. Simple pleasures are overly abundant and easy to obtain. It is a satisfaction with what one has, not getting what

they want, that makes one happy. There is enough resources on Earth for everyone's need, but never enough for anyone's greed. There is never enough to one who thinks enough is too little; the things which a person actually needs are few and easy to obtain but the things one can want are infinite, leaving nothing but a chronic dissatisfaction. In other words, the essential things that every person strives after can easily be obtained, but they, all too often, have been misled by advertisement, dogma and superstitions to pursue them through methods that promise what they seek, yet only leave them in the lurch for more. To desire and seek no more than what one needs to sustain their mental and physical health, but I find that they are one in the same.

“Imagine a machine which one could have their mind uploaded to, in exchange their “real” body would die. This digital world would allow the user to experience anything they want. Would you enter the simulation machine?”

Yes. I value the highest pleasure available to me more than anything else. If it can be above calmness, then I will accept it so long as no pains result from it. However, the machine will never be invented. The time sense wouldn't be alterable and the human brain may not be able to handle that much input at one time. Either the time sense will stay the same, which defeats the point. Or, the other

option, to alter the time sense would make the uploaded mind not my original consciousness, it would only be a clone of me.

“What do you think about death? life is so short, the thought of death haunts me...”

Death is nothing to me: when I am alive, I am not dead and when I am dead I cannot experience death. Evil lies not in what will end life, but what will take away a calm mind and replace it with a chaotic mind and then continue to live. Death ends both a chaotic and a peaceful mind, so it is not good or evil itself. All passes in due time; nothing lasts forever. This makes pains bearable and pleasures even more valued. So too this statement will pass when there are no humans left to think it. But with unlimited time or power, one cannot appreciate what one has.

“I’ll ask a cliché one, what is the meaning of life?”

The “meaning of life” can be rephrased to the definition of meaning: a worthwhile thing(s). Thus, “what worthwhile thing(s) are there in life?”. As I have explained, pleasure, more specifically, calmness brought about by living in accord with reason. The point of life is simply to live for awhile. So obvious, yet so many rush around in a panic as if they needed to achieve something beyond themselves. There is no particular thing you ought to get to; one does

not see a play for the ending, but for the play. Life has no intrinsic value because it allows you to decide for yourself what you want it to be about and how you ought to live or what to do.

“Well, that's about it for my morality questions. How did you answer my questions so easily? What criteria did you use?”

Reason. Specifically, analysis of fallacies. Reason, contrary to popular belief, is objective. For instance, stating that, “All things are doul”, implies that all things are singular also. This is a self-contradiction. A cannot equal not A. Some more examples of this fallacy are, “Everything is relative”, which states an objective knowledge, “Since all things cannot be known, all knowledge is incomplete”, which claims complete knowledge, and “If it cannot be tested, it is not worthy of debate.”, which cannot be tested. The next fallacy is that of irrelevant information to any logical argument. This is especially prevalent in pseudo-arguments, which appear to make a valid claim, yet lack sufficient reasoning. All irrelevant, emotional or any attacks on the person, rather than an argument, ought to be ignored after they are thought over. For instance, the statement, “A hypocrite cannot be trusted by anyone” attacks the person of the hypocrite and does not disprove any arguments that they

are asserting. This serves as a distraction in order to “win” against an opponent. On that note, authority, popularity, credibility and naturalness are not proof of truth nor goodness. No evidence can be taken as valid from any source so long as the possibility it may have been fabricated is still open: use the paper scientific journals, they are dependent upon the accuracy of the information they provide, unlike the internet-based journals which rely on publishing as many articles as possible, regardless of their accuracy. Next, it is rather useful to identify one's bias to confirm their own ideas and ignore contrary information. While not a fallacy itself, it can lead to fallacies by ignoring the truth. Be sure to assess contrary information. Another fallacy involves one assuming that since one event occurs before another, that the former event must have caused the latter. The bias I previously mentioned applies strongly here. The few remaining fallacies are that of providing an example as a definition, as a definition must include the essential properties of the thing in question. The argument that claims personal understanding determines truth, which it does not. Next, the assertion that there are only two options in a situation where there are more. This is done to make the chooser decide on something that will benefit the question-asker while feeling like they are free to pick. Also, premises



must support the conclusion and the conclusion must follow from the premises. In other words, the argument must be coherent. If I say, "The universe exists, therefore God exists", there is no connection between the evidence and the conclusion. A claim from personal experience is illegitimate unless supported by substantial evidence as personal experience is subject to personal bias. A claim that many religious people and conspiracy theorists will try to make is, implicitly, "Since you can disprove my argument, it must be correct.". However, not being able to prove a claim false is not proof of the claim's truth. So, it is a fallacy. While speaking of religion, two other fallacies they use in their arguments are increasing the proof requirements to affirm a claim and excusing themselves from the rules of reason. Firstly, proof requirements must be clearly defined and based on reason else increasing such requirements is likely to happen, resulting in no conclusion and appearing to affirm the claim. They usually say something like, "You can't disprove God exists, so I still believe he does.". Secondly, no argument can excuse itself from a rule of reason without valid reason to do so. This is exemplified with, "God is exempt from the rules of this reality.". And, the last few, making sure words are clearly defined, especially those that have multiple meanings. Finally, taking information in context and not

making hasty generalizations, which are mutually exclusive.

“Sorry I asked. I didn't realize it would be that much to absorb...”

It's not really. I recommend practising reasoning skills by listening to people's conversations or reading. So that when you are confronted with an argument, you will be able to dissect it also. You can also view media content to identify fallacies and see if their arguments are valid.

Sometimes the argument is implicit, like that of an advertisement: “buy our product and you will be happy!” it intends, yet does not say. For instance, this drink ad may show happy people drinking their product as a way of equating itself with happiness, which is misleading. Some do not explicitly say incorrect things, but they imply them in a distraction.

“Thanks. If only I had known this...”

Instead of, “If only...” use, “Next time...”. Now you can use it, that's what matters.

“That helps. Another question, not all things can be solved using reason alone, but by experiment. What are your thoughts on a method for such?”

Ah, the scientific method. Firstly, one must make a claim they are testing in, “If [blank], then [blank]” format. For example, “If this plant receives extra fertilizer, among

other ideal conditions, it will grow faster.”, this is called a hypothesis. From here a control group of non-extra fertilizer, but otherwise ideal condition plants (of the same species) would be made for comparing their growth to that of the fertilized plants. Then, the test would be run and data collection begins. Generally, the more data the better. However, if patterns are beginning to emerge, it is safe to assume the accuracy of the data and cease recording. Once this point is reached, analysing the data and drawing conclusions begin, some of which may have nothing to do with the hypothesis. Finally, submitting the conclusions to paper scientific journals in order to scrutinize the well-recorded data.

“Simple enough. That's all the questions I have for now.”

## APHORISMS

The main problem with doing one thing with life, such as writing or engineering, is that one ends up doing those things too much and they become boring.

Do not pretend things are fine or under control when they are not.

Be careful to not become what you despise.

If you carry someone else's load, they never consider if they should be carrying it in the first place.

People become old once they become lazy.

Your mind is the most powerful tool you have.

Reality is what one experiences.

Under promise, over deliver.

Loneliness is cured once you realize you have yourself.

Not lost, but gone before.

If it treats the effects and not the cause, the treatment is worse than failing altogether.

Unless necessary to live well, do not seek approval from anyone but yourself.

Blunders are unavoidable as ignorance is unavoidable, learn from your blunders, else you will have committed twice as many.

Half of knowledge is remembering to use it. The other half is using it properly.

Hope only raises us up for the inevitable fall. It is not hope that drives me, but reason.

State the problem truthfully and you'll be solving half of it.

Unknowns are sometimes exaggerated in the mind.

If you would be a warrior, expect to be broken. If you

would be an explorer, expect to be lost. If you would be a philosopher, expect to be both.

I begin my arguments with: I accept the idea that all ideas I propose could be incorrect. I seek truth, so if I am proven incorrect I will gladly change to avoid further harm to myself. But, I only ask that you do the same also. If they reject, I do not argue further. If they accept, I engage in argument. If they say “maybe”, then I also do not argue further: I cannot afford to waste my time and mental sanity on arguing with something ill equipped to argue. This can also be used to find other philosophers.

When boredom emerges, let it consume you. It sparks creativity and spurs one to take action.

If information cannot be lived out, it is worthless to the one who wants to improve their life.

Either pay the smaller price of using reason or the larger price of not using it. It is easier overall to live in accord to this dictates of reason rather than the dictates of irrationality.

Time is not a commodity like bread, it is the very

substance of life.

To solve any problem, break it down into small enough parts to understand each.

Asking the right questions is as important as giving the right answers to the one who wishes to live well.

Necessity is situational, not universal rule.

Knowing your weaknesses is a great strength.

Listen to understand, not to reply.

It's not living off the land, its living with the land.

One is not disturbed by events, but by their judgements about events.

Build endurance to pain, so that when it comes involuntarily, you will be ready.

Quality is always better than quantity.

A prison is just a place where a person is against their will.

You can tell the truth, but not force anyone to accept it.

Expecting others to use common sense is, in itself, a failure of common sense.

Use what you have to get where you want to be.

What is the best use of your time, right now?

True success is not being on top of a hierarchy, it is standing outside all hierarchies.

When looking for solutions, look at what has changed and not what has stayed the same.

There is no intrinsic importance; a human is not intrinsically more valuable than a grain of sand. However, I value myself more than a grain of sand. It is a matter of perception.

When you accept your current emotional state fully then you and choose to be content with it, you can move on. This also works with pain. You do not need to accept the current situation you find yourself in, only the emotions



that are made from it. This is a quick fix, but in a diseased environment, one can expect to keep getting sick. So, find a better place.

Kindness is only applicable to those who suffer because of the actions of others. Do not help those who inflict misery upon themselves: they will bring it onto you also. One may think they are saving a drowning man, but they only bringing about their own disaster.

One seeks others when one is incompetent by themselves. Greatness knows itself! Do not seek comfort from others but only from yourself.

END

Email: [philo.anony@gmail.com](mailto:philo.anony@gmail.com)

YouTube Channel: [Philosophy Safearus](#)

Patreon: Safearus

Reddit: Safearus